

MS#180490.01 (4969)

REMARKS

Applicant has thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks. The application has been amended to more clearly set forth the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-19, 21-23, 25-30, and 32-46 are presented in the application for further examination. Claims 1, 15, 22, 29, 38, 40, 42 and 44 have been amended by this Amendment B. Claims 4, 20, 24 and 31 have been canceled by this Amendment B. Reconsideration of the application claims as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION BASED ON 35 USC 112

Claim 24 stands rejected as being indefinite less than 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicant has canceled the claim, thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION BASED ON 35 USC 102(e)

As specified in paragraphs 6-7 of the Office action, claims 22 and 40 stand rejected as anticipated by Desai et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,820,204).

Claim 22 has been amended to be directed to the subject matter of canceled claim 24 and now recites

exposing a menu to the user on the display interface of the network communication device, said menu allowing the user to identify the certain clients, the method of access, and the level of access; and
transmitting information indicating the identified certain clients, the method of access, and the level of access to the web-services provider in a digital message format

The Examiner states that Desai et al. teaches that a vender is granted access to a view by providing an access code or password via telephone. (Desai et al., column 14, lines 7-15) But, Desai et al. fails to teach that the password transmits "the level of access to the web services provider in a digital format", as recited by claim 22. Thus, Desai et al. does not anticipate claim 22 and the rejection of independent claim 22 and claims 23 and 25-28 depending thereon should be withdrawn.

MS#180490.01 (4969)

With regard to claim 40, claim 40 has been amended to more clearly recite that the option list presented to the user is generated **"in response to the third party's request for user-specific information"**.

In Desai et al, the user initiates the access granting process by selecting a data element. (Desai et al., column 13, lines 17-21 and 21-29, Fig. 7). Furthermore, once the user decides to deny access to a third party, the third party is simply rejected and is not offered the opportunity to make a request to the user for access to the user's information. (Desai et al., column 13, line 62 – column 14, line 2; Fig. 10). Thus, Desai et al. fails to generate **"an option list in response to the third party's request for user-specific information"**.

The Examiner again cites column 9, lines 19-22 and column 13, lines 25-33 to support the rejection. These sections of Desai relate to a vendor retrieving purchase information and matching a merchant's public key to the user's secret key. Therefore, Desai does not teach **"generating an option list in response to third party's request for user-specific information"** and then **"prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option"**, as recited by claim 40. Thus, Desai et al. does not anticipate claim 40 and the rejection of independent claim 40 and claim 41 depending thereon should be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION BASED ON 35 USC 103(a)

As specified in paragraphs 23-27 of the Office action, claim 15 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Orita (U.S. Pat. 5,163,147) in view of Desai et al. Claim 15 has been amended to be directed to the subject matter of canceled claim 20 and now recites

a consent engine generating an option list **in response to the client's request for user-specific information** having at least one entry therein based on the intended use by the client of the user-specific information in the data store, said consent engine displaying on the display interface of the network communication device an option menu reflecting the generated option list, **said option menu prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option** displayed on the option menu using the selection interface of the network communication device.

MS#180490.01 (496:9)

Furthermore, claim 20 had been rejected as being unpatentable over Orita and Desai et al. in view of Kramer et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,414,852). Applicant submits that amended independent claim 15 is patentable over Orita, Desai and Kramer, either taken separately or in combination, such that the rejection based on 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Orita teaches a computer system with centralized file security functions that only permits registered users have access to all of their profiles. Once the user has been denied access to a file, the user's request is rejected and the user is not offered the opportunity to make a request to the administrator for access to the file. (Orita et al., column 4, lines 39–45, Fig. 2). Thus, Orita does not teach **"generating an option list in response to the client's request for user-specific information"** by claim 15.

Kramer et al. teaches that once the user has been denied access to a data object, the user is denied access to the data object and the user is not offered the opportunity to make a request to the administrator for access to the file. (Kramer et al., column 5, lines 25–41, Fig. 4). Thus, Kramer et al. does not teach **"generating an option list in response to the client's request for user-specific information"** and **"said option menu prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option"** as recited in claim 15.

For the reasons stated above, Desai et al. teaches that once the user decides to deny access to a third party, the third party is simply rejected and the third party is not offered the opportunity to make a request to the user for access to the user's information. (Desai et al., column 13, line 62 – column 14, line 2; Fig. 10). Thus, Desai et al., like Kramer et al. and Orita, does not teach **"generating an option list in response to the client's request for user-specific information"** and **"said option menu prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option"** as recited by claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 is patentable over Orita and Desai et al. in view of Kramer et al. and the rejection of independent claim 15 and claims 16-19 and 21 depending thereon should be withdrawn.

MS#180490.01 (49:9)

As specified in paragraphs 38-44 of the Office action, claims 1, 29, 38 and 44 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Orita in view of Desai et al. and Bradee (U.S. App. 2002/0095571). Claims 4 and 31 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Orita, Desai et al., Bradee in view of Kramer et al. Claim 1 has been amended to be directed to the subject matter of canceled claim 4 and now recites

wherein the user communicates with the web-services provider via a network communication device having a display interface and a selection interface, the method further comprising:

generating an option list in response to the client's request for user-specific information having at least one entry therein based on the determined intended use by the client of the requested user-specific information in the data store;

displaying to the user on the display interface of the network communication device an option menu reflecting the generated option list, said option menu prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option using the selection interface of the network communication device, and said option list generated in response to the client's request for user-specific information;

receiving from the network communication device a selection signal indicative of whether the user accepted or rejected the at least one option; and

creating an access control rule based on the received selection signal, said access control rule defining the extent of access to the requested user-specific information in the data store granted to the client.

Claim 29 has been amended to be directed to the subject matter of canceled claim 31 and now recites

a consent engine generating an option list in response to the client's request for user-specific information having at least one entry therein based on the intended use by the client of the user-specific information in the data store, said consent engine displaying on the display interface of the network communication device an option menu reflecting the generated option list, said option menu prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option displayed on the option menu using the selection interface of the network communication device.

MS#180490.01 (496:9)

Claim 38 as amended recites

a consent engine generating an option list **in response to the client's request for user-specific information** having at least one entry therein based on the intended use by the client of the user-specific information in the data store, said consent engine displaying on the display interface of the network communication device an option menu reflecting the generated option list, said option menu **prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option** displayed on the option menu using the selection interface of the network communication device.

Claim 44 as amended recites

wherein the access control engine has access to a consent engine generating an option list **in response to the client's request for user-specific information** having at least one entry therein based on the intended use by the client of the user-specific information in the data store, said consent engine displaying on the display interface of the network communication device an option menu reflecting the generated option list, said option menu **prompting the user to accept or reject at least one option** displayed on the option menu using the selection interface of the network communication device.

Bradee teaches that a user is authenticated on a computer system where the user application program logic interprets the permissions in relation to the requested resource. (Bradee, page 5, paragraph 42). Access is either permitted or denied and once the user has been denied access to the requested resource, the user's request is rejected and the user is not offered the opportunity to make a request to the administrator for access to the file. (Bradee, page 5, paragraph 42). Thus, Bradee, like Orita, Desai et al., and Kramer et al. (for reasons explained above), does not teach "generating an option list **in response to the client's request** for user-specific information" and "said option menu **prompting the user** to accept or reject at least one option" as recited by claims 1, 29, 38 and 44. Therefore, the rejection of independent claims 1, 29, 38 and 44 and claims 2-3, 5-14, 30, 32-37, 39, and 45-46 depending thereon should be withdrawn.

As specified in paragraphs 80-90 of the Office action, claim 42 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Orita in view of Desai et al., Bradee and Kramer et al.

MS#180490.01 (4969)

Applicant submits that amended independent claim 42 is patentable over Orita, Desai Bradee and Kramer, either taken separately or in combination, such that the rejection based on 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Claim 42 as amended recites

generating a set of menu entries in response to the third party's proposal, said menu entries identifying...

prompting the user to authorize or deny the third party to access the certain user-specific information in the data store...

For the reasons stated above, Bradee, Orita, Desai et al., and Kramer et al. do not teach "generating a set of menu entries in response to the third party's proposal, said menu entries identifying" and "prompting the user to authorize or deny the third party to access the certain user-specific information in the data store" as recited by claim 42. Therefore, the rejection of independent claim 42 and claim 43 depending thereon should be withdrawn.

MS#180490.01 (4969)

CONCLUSION

A Request for Applicant Initiated Interview and a Request of Continued Examination are being filed simultaneously with this Amendment B.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Applicant does not believe that a fee is due in connection with this response. If, however, the Commissioner determines that a fee is due, he is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/cwa